

REMARKS

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17, 19, 20, 24, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tentij et al, U.S. Patent 6,513,129 B1.

Claims 4-6, 9, 12-14, 18, 21-23, 25, and 28-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicant(s) have amended independent claims 1, 8, 17, and 24 and canceled claims 4, 9, 18, and 25 to incorporate allowable subject matter into the independent claims and to distinguish the claims over the Tentij reference.

Claims 2-3, 5-7, 10-16, 19-23, and 26-30 (as amended as necessary) are believed to be in condition for allowance as each depends from what is now believed to be an allowable base claim.

The Office Action rejects claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tentij et al. Again, claim 16 is now believed to be an allowable dependent claim.

Applicant(s) believe that all information and requirements for the application have been provided to the USPTO. If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of the Application, Applicant(s) invite the Examiner to call the undersigned attorney at the Examiner's convenience.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due with this Response to U.S. PTO Account No. 09-0449.

Respectfully submitted,
QUARLES & BRADY LLP

January 5, 2007

By: 

Gavin J. Milczarek-Desai
45,801